DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 138 TM 830 134

AUTHOR House, Gary D.
TITLE A Review of the Personal Profile System.
PUB DATE 5 Aug 82
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation Methods; Raw Scores; *Self Concept Measures; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Test Interpretation; *Test Reliability; *Test Reviews; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Personal Profile System

ABSTRACT

The Personal Profile System (PPS) is a self-referent device to measure behavioral responses of individuals on the dimensions of dominance, inducement of others, steadiness, and compliance. The PPS booklet contains: (1) a measurement device which generates scores for each dimension, (2) graphs for plotting obtained scores, (3) directions for interpreting scores, and (4) interpretation formats. PPS was reviewed from several perspectives: the meaning and validity of its measurement task and scoring; its interpretation; its adherence to the theory upon which it is based; the evidence concerning its validity and reliability. It was found that all obtained scores misrepresent their actual level of measurement. Results indicate that interpretations are based upon misleading and inappropriately determined numbers. The instrument departs somewhat from its theoretical model, and available evidence is heavily against an objective judgment of instrument validity. No evidence of reliability was found. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227138

A Review of the Personal Profile System

Gary D. House

Customer Services Staff Supervisor

Directory Course Development

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company

St. Louis, Missouri

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED E
G.D. House

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM830134

Running head: Personal Profile System Review

Abstract

The Personal Profile System (PPS) was reviewed from several perspectives: the meaning and validity of its measurement task and scoring; its interpretation; its adherence to the theory upon which it is based; the evidence concerning its validity and reliability. It was found that all obtained scores misrepresent their actual level of measurement. Interpretations are based upon misleading and inappropriately determined numbers. The instrument departs somewhat from its theoretical model, and available evidence is heavily against an objective judgement of instrument validity. No evidence of reliability was found.

A Review of the

Personal Profile System

This is a formal review of the Personal Profile System (Geier, 1977-Rev. 1979), an instrument which portends to measure behavioral responses of persons along four dimensions. Those dimensions are Dominance, Inducement of Others, Steadiness and Compliance. Two forms of the instrument are available. The blue form is intended to provide measures of work-related behaviors. The orange form relates to "...personal living behavioral tendencies" (Performax, 1979, p.18). The findings of this review pertain to the blue form.

The Personal Profile System (PPS) consists of a booklet containing the following components:

- A measurement device which generates scores for each of the four dimensions.
- Graphs for plotting obtained scores.
- Directions for interpreting scores.
- Three interpretation formats, or steps.

According to a published brochure (Performax, 1980), the PPS is a scientific instrument or tool, developed by professionals in the behavioral sciences. Contained in the brochure, appearing also on the instrument booklet (Geier, 1977-Rev. 1979,

pp.1 and 20) and in the manual accompanying the booklet (Performax, 1979, pp. 19-33), are a number of claims as to the benefits of the PPS. Among those claims are the following:

- It will help you discover and understand your own behavior.
- It helps you develop a plan to build on strengths and minimize weakness.
- It reveals tendencies in behavior.
- It can improve the health and financial condition of every business and organization.
- It is useful in team building.
- It gives you an advance look at the ways people are apt to respond under varying conditions.
- It offers a scientific way to avoid costly mistakes in employee selection.
- It will help your associates improve their lives, productivity and interpersonal relationships.
- It ads to your understanding of different behavioral types.
- It identifies areas of interpersonal conflict.
- It enables you to create the motivational environment most conducive to success.

- It has been proven effective in training and development, coaching and counseling, hiring and placement, performance appraisal, career planning, team building and conflict resolution.

This review begins with a description of the PPS measurement task, its scoring and interpretation. Included in the first section is an evaluation of the processes and procedures described.

The theory behind the instrument is presented, and the faithfulness of the instrument to its avowed theoretical base is discussed.

Validity and reliability issues relevant to existing evidence concerning them are presented following the section on matters of theory.

Finally, a brief section of additional comments closes the review.

The Measurement Task, Scoring and Interpretation of the Personal Profile System

Page one of the PPS booklet (Geier, 1977-Rev. 1979) provides a brief discussion of what the instrument portends to do. The actual measurement device appears on page two. This device consists of 24 segments or cells, each containing four descriptive terms.

The respondent is directed to indicate with a special marker, which one of the four terms in each cell is "Most" like him or her, and which one of the four terms in each cell is "Least" like him or her. Each selection reveals one of five symbols. Four symbols are representative of the four dimensions for which scores are derived, and one represents a fifth category of responses which does not count in the calculation of dimension scores.

After all marks are made, the respondent counts all symbols standing for "D"(Dominance), "I" (Influencing of Others), "S"(Steadiness), and "C"(Compliance), separately for "Most" and "Least" responses.

The counts are plotted on two graphs (p.5). Graph I contains plots for "Most" counts on each dimension, and is

labeled, "Graph I behavior: expected by others". Graph II contains plots for "Least" counts, and is labeled, "Graph II behavior: instinctive response to pressure".

After Graphs I and II have been completed, the counts on Graph II are subtracted from the counts on Graph I, and a third Graph containing the differences in counts is plotted. This third graph is labeled, "Graph III behavior: self perception".

In addition to the numerals within the graphs, sets of numerals appear on the outside of each. On the left side is a set of numerals ranging from one to twenty-eight, and ascending from the bottom to the top of the graph. On the right side is a set of numerals, also ascending from bottom to top, but in this case ranging from one to six. These external numerals come into play during the interpretation of the graphed data.

Interpretation proceeds in a series of steps. First, the respondent is asked to circle the highest of all plots on Graph III. If two of those plots are equally high, then respondents are refered to Graph II. Having identified the dimension represented by the highest plot, interpretation continues.

The respondent is directed to read on page 7 a description representative of the dimension identified by the highest

plotting point. (Sections representing all four dimensions are included on page 7.) Each section contains lists of descriptive phrases indicating behavior tendencies, desired environments, needs relative to other persons, and effectiveness needs. The respondent is encouraged to underline phrases that are accurate, delete phrases which do not apply, and substitute phrases from other sections. This first step is called "General Highlights" (p.6).

Next, the respondent is refered to page 8. There he/she is directed to locate numbered lines containing hidden words. There are 28 hidden words under each of four columns (headed "D", "I", "S" and "C" respectively).

The three graphs are used to identify locations within each column. Locations are identified by drawing horizontal lines from "D", "I", "S" and "C" graphed points to their corresponding values on the 28-numeral scales. These positions transfer directly to the numbered lines on page 8.

The special markers are again used. This time they are rubbed back-and-forth across the three spaces above and the three spaces below the identified lines (as well as on the identified lines themselves). The respondent does this first for Graph III and then for Graphs I and II if their plotted

points are different. Use of the marker reveals the hidden words. Once these steps have been taken, the respondent is told to "Personalize your interpretation:

- Use an X to indicate agreement
- Use an O to indicate disagreement
- Use a ? to indicate doubt" (p. 8).

The interpretive stage described above is called "Dimensional inter sity index" (pp. 6 and 8).

The third interpretive stage, "classical profile patterns" (pp. 6 and 13), proceeds methodically. On page 9 the respondent is directed back to the three graphs. This time he/she is told to determine the numerals, on the 6-point scale to the right of each graph, which correspond to each of the "D", "I", "S" and "C" plotted values. Three, four-digit numbers are produced. These numbers range from 1111 to 6666. The 1296 possible outcomes obtained from this procedure are listed on pages 9 through 12. Each four-digit number is assigned one of 18 names which correspond to eighteen descriptions of characteristics of persons with similar profiles. These descriptions appear on pages 14 through 19. They include information on emotions, goals, criteria for judging others, how others are influenced, value to organizations, what tendencies they overuse, how they react

to pressure, what they fear, how they would increase effectiveness with others, and more. The descriptions are said to be based "...upon the behavioral tendencies demonstrated by people with specific configurations of plotting points" (p. 13).

A variety of considerations for the interpretation of these profile patterns is suggested on page 13.

The remainder of this section of the review evaluates the measurement task as well as the scoring and interpretation factors just described. Exhibit 1 is a facsimile of the measurement device used in the Personal Profile System.

Insert Exhibit 1 about here

Like the actual instrument, Exhibit 1 contains 24 cells representing the 24 measurement tasks required of respondents. The order of the cells in Exhibit 1 resulted from a random rearrangement of the PPS cells, and the order of terms within the cells has been changed. Decimal numerals appear in place of the actual descriptive terms contained on the PPS.

Under the "Most" and "Least" columns are letters representing the four measured dimensions. "D" stands for Dominance; "I" stands for Influencing of Others; "S" represents Steadiness;

EXHIBIT 1

Facsimile of Personal Profile System

Measurement Device

	M	L		M	L		M	L		M	L
1.			7.			13.			19.		
1.1	* C	N	7.1	* N	D	13.1	*S	N	19.1	D	D
1.2	S	S	7.2	S	S	13.2	I	I	19.2	*N	S
1.3	D	D	7.3	C	C	13.3	C	C	19.3	C	C
1.4	* N	I	7.4	* I	N	13.4	*D	N	19.4	I	I
2.			8.			14.			20.		
2.1	* N	S	8.1	I	I	14.1	S	S	20.1	*N	C
2.2	* N	C	8.2	* C	N	14.2	*N	C	20.2	I	I
2.3	* D	N	8.3	D	D	14.3	D	D	20.3	S	S
2.4	* I	N	8.4	S	S	14.4	*N	I	20.4	D	D
3.			9.			15.			21.		
3.1	D	D	9.1	* I	N	15.1	C	C	21.1	S	S
3.2	C	C	9.2	* N	D	15.2	I	I	21.2	I	I
3.3	* S	N	9.3	S	S	15.3	S	S	21.3	*C	N
3.4	* N	I	9.4	C	C	15.4	D	D	21.4	D	D
4.			10.			16.			22.		
4.1	D	D	10.1	S	S	16.1	C	C	22.1	S	S
4.2	* N	C	10.2	* D	N	16.2	D	D	22.2	*N	D
4.3	* S	N	10.3	* N	C	16.3	***S	I	22.3	*N	I
4.4	* I	N	10.4	I	I	16.4	*N	S	22.4	C	C
5.			11.			17.			23.		
5.1	* S	N	11.1	S	S	17.1	*N	S	23.1	D	D
5.2	I	I	11.2	* C	N	17.2	D	D	23.2	I	I
5.3	D	D	11.3	D	D	17.3	I	I	23.3	S	S
5.4	* N	C	11.4	* N	I	17.4	*C	N	23.4	*N	C
6.			12.			18.			24.		
6.1	S	S	12.1	I	I	18.1	I	I	24.1	*N	C
6.2	D	D	12.2	D	D	18.2	*N	C	24.2	D	D
6.3	* C	N	12.3	* C	N	18.3	*S	N	24.3	*I	N
6.4	* N	I	12.4	* N	S	18.4	D	D	24.4	*N	S

M = Most
L = Least

and "C" is for Compliance. The letter "N" indicates that if the respondent selects the corresponding term under that column, then it does not count as a score for any of the dimensions. A single asterisk marks the "N" locations for easy reference.

The one location with three asterisks (number 16.3) identifies a term which is scored on the "S" dimension if chosen as "Most" and on the "I" dimension if chosen as "Least".

The reader will recall that the task for the respondent is to indicate which of the four terms in each cell is "Most" like him/her, and which is "Least" like him/her. One of each set of four terms is selected as having the highest degree of relevance to the respondent, and another of the same set of terms is selected as having the lowest degree of relevance. This is actually an ordering process. The respondent is ranking two of the four terms as either one-of-four or four-of-four.

With regard to the remaining two terms (those not selected as either "Most" or "Least"), information is also available. Their respective ranks are either two-of-four, and three-of-four or vice versa. In the absence of more precise information about how relevant these remaining terms are to the respondent, the best estimate of their value is equal to one-half of the rank distance between them: two and one-half-of-four.

All four terms in each cell are evidence that the dimensions whose measurement they represent are relevant to the respondent. None is evidence that a dimension is not relevant. This conceptual conclusion is inherent in the way the measures are taken. Identifying a term as least relevant among four choices does not mean that the term is not relevant. It means that it is less relevant than the remaining three.

Because the 24 measurement tasks required by this instrument consist of repeated rankings of sets of four terms each, the level of measurement is ordinal. The scoring process used by Geier (that of adding together all of the "D", "I", "S" and "C" measures under "Most" and "Least" conditions) is inappropriate. It ignores a great deal of information, and it treats the data as though they were obtained from two different interval scales.

Because all of the evidence provided by this instrument is for the relevance of each dimension, it is conceptually fallacious to subtract one piece of evidence from another. Geier's process of subtracting "Least" counts from "Most" counts is fundamentally unsound.

In light of the limitations created by the measurement tasks, the plotting of "Most" and "Least" counts on the "D", "I", "S" and "C" dimensions is misleading. These plots misrepresent the

available information as interval in nature, and imply that two unrelated observations have been made. The reality is that the only summary information attainable must come from the 24 separate ordinal observations.

Graph III derives its plotted values from the erroneous information contained in the first and second graphs, and is by definition flawed.

In order to make another point it is necessary to refer again to Exhibit 1. By examining each single-asterisked position it can be seen that the terms corresponding to those positions are counted as evidence for "D", "I", "S" or "C" in either the "Most" or "Least" columns, but not in both. The implication is that the terms in those positions can be considered valid measures of their particular dimensions at one end of the scale but not at the other. This is not a sound measurement practice. While it is possible for a given measurement tool to vary in precision from one point to another, the validity of its measures is not free to vary. If a measure is not valid at one point along its scale, then it is not valid at any point along its scale.

Of the 96 terms used to measure the four dimensions of this instrument, 44 are invalidated because they are not accepted as measures at one point along their scale. Another term (number

16.3) is invalidated because it is accepted as evidence on two different scales.

Because various terms throughout the instrument are invalidated by the way the instrument is scored, it is difficult for the information they make available to be summarized in a meaningful way. Consider the following:

- Only one item (number 15 on the facsimile) has a potential for four ranks.
- Five items (numbers 8, 19, 20, 21 and 23) have been limited to a possibility of 3 ranks.
- Fifteen items (numbers 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18 and 22) are constrained to two possible ranks.
- Two items (numbers 4 and 24) have only one item that can be ranked.
- One item (number 2) contains no valid terms and cannot be ranked.

At this point it is timely to introduce two issues raised in the Personal Profile System manual (Performax, 1979). The first issue is introduced on page 5. There it states, "Forced choice selection is used to measure behavior along the four dimensions". On page 10 two more references are made to forced

choice. One states that it is common for respondents to feel contradictory in such a situation. The other explains that the respondent is being forced to make finer and finer discriminations throughout the instrument.

The second issue raised is also from page 10. Continuing to respond in the context of forced choice, the text states, "At the risk of oversimplifying, some of your choices do not count and are distractors". The apparent reference here is to the response options scored "X".

With regard to the forced choice issue, it is clear that the Personal Profile System forces choices among measures of different dimensions. The choices that are being forced are relative to what ranks are to be assigned to each dimension on 24 separate occurances. Those tasks do not imply that finer and finer discriminations are being made. To do that under a forced choice format would be best accomplished if the different terms being rated measured the same dimension, but at different levels of precision.

It is possible that choices among measures of the four different dimensions might provide better and better discriminations if grouped systematically according to their empirically determined statistical weights, but nothing in the manual

indicates that this has been done, and the way the scores are calculated does not suggest that variations in precision exist among the 24 tasks.

On the issue of distractors, it is difficult to imagine of what use they would be on an instrument of this kind. The point is to try to measure each dimension as fully as possible, and not to distract the respondent from that task. It is illogical to define a term as a distractor and then count it as evidence for a dimension if it is selected at a given score level. Yet all of the "N" coded terms, as shown on Exhibit 1, are counted if selected on one end of the measurement scale.

Turning briefly to the issue of instrument interpretation, it is appropriate to refer again to the Personal Profile System manual (Performax, 1979). On pages 17 and 18 are directions to be given respondents in advance of completing the measurement task. Respondents are told to mark their respones as they see themselves functioning, "...not how you would like to be and not what you think that other people expect of you or how they see you, but how you actually see yourself interacting with the other team members" (p.18).

Despite the above response set, the instrument scores are plotted on three different graphs representing three different

interpretations of those scores. The reader will recall that the three graphs were named: "Graph I behavior: expected by others"; "Graph II behavior: instinctive response to pressure"; and "Graph III behavior: self perception".

The first of these graph names implies an interpretation which contradicts the instructions to respondents. The second graph name has no relationship to the instructions. The third graph name logically follows from the response set directions.

None of the numbers plotted in any of the three graphs, however, is consistent with the level of measurement reflected by the response requirements. Therefore, any use of the obtained and plotted values is somewhat misleading.

The descriptions of behavioral tendencies throughout the interpretive process are said to be based upon research (Performax, 1979, p.6). This reviewer does not dispute that statement. What is disputed is the way in which numbers are used in the scoring and interpretation of the instrument.

Theory Behind the Instrument

The manual for using the Personal Profile System (Performax, 1979, p. 2) states that the instrument builds upon the work of William Moulton Marston. Marston is said to have identified four dimensions of behavioral responses: Dominance; Inducement of Others; Steadiness; and Compliance (p. 2).

Geier developed the Personal Profile System using as items, terms employed by Marston, but modified for current usage (p. 5).

In Emotions of Normal People (Marston, 1928, p. 112), the psychologist theorizes that human beings have four primary emotions: Compliance, Dominance, Inducement, and Submission. Marston establishes correlates of these emotions in both physical events and in the behavior of persons as described in "inexact" (p. 243) language of "literature" (p. 40), "popular" (p. 272) conversation, "pseudo-psychology" (p. 140) and "psychology" (p. 140).

Below are presented Marston's primary emotions as listed in his book, and the four dimensions of behavioral responses attributed to Marston in the Personal Profile System (PPS) manual.

Marston's Emotions	PPS Manual Dimensions of Behavioral Responses
Dominance	Dominance
Inducement	Inducement of Others
Submission	Steadiness
Compliance	Compliance

The two lists are congruent except at one point: Submission versus Steadiness. The Personal Profile System manual does not offer an explanation for this discrepancy.

Five references are cited on page three of the Personal Profile System manual as representative of research which has examined the validity of the study of human behavior according to a four-dimensional model. Three additional references are included as examples of research into the validity, reliability and internal consistency of measurement devices related to the four-dimensional model.

There are two problems associated with these references. The first is that it is not stated that any of the research described in them is relevant to either Marston's model or to Geier's instrument. The other is that only authors' last names and publication dates are cited. The latter condition makes it virtually impossible to find and examine them.

In conjunction with a discussion of the development of instrumentation for use in identifying individual differences in people, and of meeting a need to build upon individual strengths, the Personal Profile System manual provides three specific references (p. 4).

Two of these references were located in a survey of the library holdings of three major universities and two public libraries of considerable size. The two references found were Bormann (1965), and Geier (1967).

The pages cited in the Bormann reference (pp. 346-385) contained Chapter 15, "Collecting Data". Under the second main heading of this chapter, "Direct Observation and the Collection of Data" (p. 359), was a minor subheading, "Direct Observation without Quantification" (p. 359). In this section the use of group observations, tape recordings of group meetings, the production of transcriptions from tape recordings, interviewing, and the use of questionnaires as data collection strategies was discussed. Bormann cited Geier's dissertation as an example of research employing these methods (p. 360). Bormann made no mention either of Marston or of any of the four dimensions relevant to this discussion of the theory behind the Personal Profile System.

The Geier article described a study in which an attempt was made to determine what factors might affect the emergence of leaders in groups whose functions were begun without leaders being identified. A total of five factors negatively affecting leadership emergence was cited:

- perception of being uninformed (p. 321).
- nonparticipation (p. 321).
- extreme rigidity (p. 321).
- being perceived as authoritative (p. 322).
- offensive verbalization (p. 322).

As was true of the Bormann reference, the Geier article appeared to be unrelated to Marston's theory and to the development of instrumentation for measuring the four Personal Profile System dimensions.

Validity and Reliability

Part II of the Personal Profile System manual (pp. 7-15) discusses the validity and reliability of the instrument. The discussion concerning reliability consists of statements such as, "Our research shows good reliability..." (p. 8); "...the reliability is good" (p. 9); "From the standpoint of reliability, the results are certainly in the same ballpark" (p. 9). No coefficients of reliability are reported.

With regard to validity, three specific references are cited. Two are identified as available for review. The first (Meskin, 1974) is an article about dental team building. Reference is made to an instrument named the Geier Personal Work Profile (p. 468). This instrument is said to contain four scales: Dominance; Influencing People; Steadiness; and Compatibility.

Three hundred Minnesota dentists were administered the instrument and some additional data were obtained concurrently. Subjects were grouped according to their profile configurations. Five groups are listed: High D; High I; High S; High C; and Misc. (p. 471). The number of dentists in each group is not reported, and while no statistical tests of significance are cited, the following findings are forwarded:

- High D dentists hired more dental auxiliaries than did other dentists (p. 470).
- High D dentists worked more hours than did other profile counterparts (p.470).
- High D dentists appeared more satisfied with auxiliaries most like themselves (p. 470).

The Meskin article does not describe a validity study. It was an article urging dentists to consider compatibility issues in team building. As such, it reported the results of a study that assumed the validity of the Geier instrument. As was stated earlier, no evidence was provided with regard to the statistical significance of differences among dental profile categories on any of the dependent variables. It must also be noted that the "C" scale in this article was identified as a measure of Compatibility, a dimension not measured by the Personal Profile System.

The second accessible reference is discussed in some detail in the manual (Performax, 1979, pp. 13-15). This study was done at the University of Notre Dame where the Center for Human Development had been using the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) in seminars.

The purpose of the study was to determine if the Personal Profile System (PPS) contained elements sufficiently representative of the POI and of the TSCS in order to justify the use of the PPS exclusively.

One hundred subjects had responded to all three instruments. The relationships among the "D", "I", "S" and "C" scale scores of the PPS and the individual item responses of the POI and the TSCS were studied through point-biserial correlation analysis.

Significantly correlated items from the POI and TSCS were placed in multiple regression models with PPS subscales as criterion measures. Some POI and TSCS items had been rejected due to multicolinearity. Multiple R's were calculated and items were further examined for their discriminate qualities relative to upper and lower quartiles of the PPS scales.

The multiple R values resulting from this study are reported in the PPS manual (pp. 14 and 15). While these coefficients are relatively high, they represent very little clear meaning.

Buros (1972, p. 288) indicates that the POI is comprised of 150 items. The TSCS has 100 items (Buros, 1972, p. 366). If this is accurate information, then in the Notre Dame study a total of 1,000 correlation coefficients was calculated.

Assuming that the .05 alpha level was applied as a criterion for each hypothesis of no significant correlation, then 50 of the 132 significant correlations (38%) could, on average, have been expected to occur due to random error.

The problem in interpreting the correlation data generated by the Notre Dame study is confounded conceptually by the fact that the coefficients were calculated in a way that obscured the theoretical meaning of the POI and TSCS items. The POI generates some 12 meaningful scale scores (Buros, 1974, p.449), and the TSCS yields 14 meaningful profile scores in its counseling form (Buros, 1974, p. 498). With this knowledge, hypothesized relationships among the meaningful components of the three instruments could have been tested.

Instead, isolated and conceptually ambiguous items were apparently used to establish some evidence that relationships among the three instruments were found.

Psychometrically, the results of this study are further confounded by the use of PPS scale scores which, if calculated as they are in the form reviewed, represent greater precision than their measurement task provides.

Finally, it is important to remember that the purpose of the Notre Dame study was to provide information for decision making.

The POI and the TSCS were in use at the University, and because of interpretive and economic considerations (Performax, 1979, pp. 13 and 15), the PPS was being considered as an alternative to both of the other instruments. Thus, it was not a validity study regarding the PPS, but a study in which the validity of the PPS was assumed.

Some Final Comments

In the behavioral sciences it is customarily the responsibility of the author of an instrument to establish its credibility. Typically, the evidence regarding credibility is contained in one or more publications which are made available to the potential users of the instrument.

The information in those publications generally includes descriptions of how the instrument was developed and validated. Populations involved in establishing norms or other interpretive systems are clearly identified. Reliability and validity coefficients are reported and interpreted. Potential limitations for the instrument's use are normally discussed.

Once the information described above has been widely disseminated, there is usually no problem in acquiring a great deal of additional data. There are literally thousands of graduate students, professors and other behavioral researchers and practitioners in the United States alone, who would be eager and exceedingly pleased to have a promising instrument to help them with their work. Papers, theses, dissertations and articles are always in need of being written.

The Personal Profile System seems to lack a firm basis for its proclaimed validity and reliability. Those data which

are available are not very relevant to these two issues, and are based upon scores representing a level of measurement not appropriate to the tasks required of respondents. Yet, according to the PPS manual (Performax, 1979, p.14), the instrument has been administered to hundreds of thousands of people. Apparently, none of the data generated by these administrations have found their way into the realm of professional literature. Neither have they found their way into the Personal Profile System manual.

Anyone considering use of the Personal Profile System may, of course, establish their own criteria for making a decision. Generally, however, they will want some level of information about the instrument's validity and reliability. It is hoped that this review will provide one perspective on those issues.

Based upon the present design of the instrument, and upon the information available about it, the evidence suggests that the PPS should be rated near the lower end of any validity scale. This reviewer has seen no objective evidence of the instrument's reliability.

References

A manual for using the Personal Profile System. Performax Systems International, Inc., U.S.A., January 1979.

Bormann, Earnest G. Theory and research in the communicative arts. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.

Buros, Oscar K. Tests in print. Highland Park, N.J. The Gryphon Press, 1974.

Buros, Oscar K. The seventh mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: The Gryphon Press, 1972.

Geier, John G. A trait approach to the study of leadership in small groups. The Journal of Communication, Vol. XVII, December 1967, pp. 316-323.

Geier, John G., Ph.D. Personal Profile System. Instrument published by Performax Systems International, Inc., 1977-Rev. 1979.

Marston, William Moulton. Emotions of normal people. Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928.

Meskin, Lawrence H. Developing dental teams for increased harmony and productivity. International Dental Journal, Volume 23, No. 4, December 1974, pp. 467-475.

The Personal Profile System "A plan to understand self and others". Brochure published by Performax Systems International, Inc., 1980.